

**University Council on Teacher Education**  
**Minutes for February 9, 2015**  
**10:00 – 12:00**  
**200 Academy Street**

**Members Present:** Michelle Cirillo, Ralph Ferretti, Barry Joyce, Alden Snell, Barbara VanDornick, Carol Vukelich, Linda Zankowsky, Kate Scantlebury

**Members Not Present:** Janice Bibik, Lynn Okagaki, Sharon Walpole, George Watson

**Guests:** Deb Bieler, Pia Inguito, KaWansi Newton-Freeman, Ali Alalou

The Council approved the December minutes as distributed.

**Announcements**

***I. Fall 2014 End of Term Undergraduate Teacher Ed Report (Barbara VanDornick)***

- Barbara reviewed the Fall 2014 End-of-Term Report. Teacher education candidates are doing very well (e.g., 70% earned a 3.0 or higher, only five were dismissed, and 2% are on probation). In addition, the good news relative to our minority candidates is that once they are admitted, we retain them.

**Old Business**

***I. Professionalism Policy For Professional Education Candidate (Carol Vukelich)***

- The policy, as revised, does not include a mid-point data collection point. This is unacceptable. UCTE reviewed a table detailing the mid-point data collection point currently used and agreed that the courses listed for each program remained acceptable. Barbara will work on completing the table for advanced programs and insert the information into the policy.
- Carol Vukelich presented the revised dispositions at the last meeting and asked members to share them broadly. UCTE reviewed the list again and voted to divide #6 into two separate dispositions. Members discussed the scale that should be used to judge candidates' demonstration of the dispositions. Members decided to use a "consistency" scale. Carol agreed to speak with Joan Buttram from the DE Research and Development Center and Ratna Nandakumar from the School of Education for their advice on how to frame the scale. The dispositions, as approved unanimously by the Council, are listed in the table below.

University of Delaware Professional Educator Dispositions

- |  |
|--|
| 1. An effective educator demonstrates commitment to the belief that all learners can achieve and persists in helping each learner reach his/her full potential.                          |
| 2. An effective educator respects and considers the input and contributions of families, colleagues, and other professionals in understanding and supporting each learner's development. |

3. An effective educator respects learners as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds, and with varying skills, abilities, perspectives, talents, and interests; he/she is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction.
4. An effective educator creates a learning environment that supports learners in promoting each other's learning and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a positive classroom climate.
5. An effective educator takes responsibility for his/her students' learning and uses ongoing analysis and reflection to improve his/her planning and practice.
6. An effective educator sees him/herself as a learner.
7. An effective educator uses current education theory, policy, and research as sources of analysis and reflection to improve his/her practice.
8. An effective educator reflects on constructive criticism and guidance, and appropriately modifies his/her behavior or practice.
9. An effective educator demonstrates the ethical use of assessment and assessment data to identify learners' strengths and needs.
10. An effective educator demonstrates professionalism by being on time; representing him/herself appropriately through dress, language and written materials; and meeting deadlines.

- Michelle Cirillo requested that the Council consider engaging in a discussion about the seriousness with which departments rate their candidates, not only on the dispositions form, but also on the assessments that fulfill program requirements. Carol Vukelich mentioned the need to reconsider the rubrics used in assessing candidates as components of each programs' Program Assessment Plans. She wondered whether it would be possible to create a rubric to evaluate lesson plans with some shared and program specific items.

***II. Report on safety policies task force (Linda Zankowsky)***

- Task Force has not met since last semester because it is waiting for the report of the data UD police gathered over winter session.

**New Business**

***I. UD Nursing (Pia Inguito, KaWansi Newton-Freeman)***

- Colleagues from the College of Health Sciences nursing program met with UCTE to share information on their efforts to diversify the nursing student pool. There are approximately 11-15% students from diverse backgrounds in the nursing program at University of Delaware. With external funding, their goal is to increase the number of students from diverse backgrounds. Students are provided merit scholarship funds, special activities, and an advisor charged with supporting them through their program. The Council found many similarities between their efforts and teacher education diversity recruitment efforts.

***II. University of Pennsylvania (Carol Vukelich)***

- Carol Vukelich asked if Council members had reviewed the "GRIT" survey and whether they wished to require our candidates to complete the survey. While members felt that the survey could provide candidates with interesting

information about themselves, because programs are in the throws of implementing so many changes this year, UCTE voted to not require survey completion at this time.

### **III. Survey Questions (Barbara VanDornick)**

- Council members reviewed the new survey questions. The new questions will be sent to CAEP in the fall for its review. The questions will be the same on the program exit, alumni, employer and cooperating teacher surveys, allowing us to compare the different groups' responses and to compare candidate exit with end-of-first-year of teaching responses. The questions are aligned with InTASC. The plan is to use the survey this spring as the end-of-program exit survey. After discussion of the rating scale, members voted to approve the survey items and use very well prepared, moderately well prepared, minimally well prepared, & not well prepared as the rating scale. The new survey items are included in the table below.

#### **Survey Questions**

**Please indicate the extent to which your University of Delaware program prepared you to:**

1. know the content and curriculum standards for the subject you teach. (e.g., Common Core, Next Generation Science, state standards) (InTASC Standards #4 and #7)
2. understand the content knowledge in the discipline you teach (InTASC Standard# 4)
3. use resources to broaden the knowledge of the discipline you teach. (InTASC Standard #5)
4. ensure developmentally appropriate learning experiences for all ages, abilities, and backgrounds by incorporating knowledge of human development (InTASC Standards #1 and #7)
5. ensure an inclusive learning environment by understanding individual differences and diverse cultures (InTASC Standard #2 and #3)
6. use digital and interactive technologies effectively to achieve learning goals (InTASC Standard #5)
7. plan and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners (InTASC Standards #7 and #8)
8. use effective research-based strategies, resources, and materials in delivering instruction (InTASC Standard #7)
9. design, modify, or select appropriate assessments to address individual student's learning goals (InTASC Standard #6)
10. use a range of developmentally-appropriate, formative and summative assessments (InTASC Standard #6)
11. examine performance data to understand each learner's progress (InTASC Standards #1, #2, #7, and #8)
12. use performance data to guide instructional planning (InTASC Standards #1, #2, #7, and #8)
13. reflect on your teaching to improve planning and practice (InTASC Standard #9)
14. use theory and research to solve problems and improve practice (InTASC Standard #7, #9, and #10)
15. collaborate with others to support the learning of all children (InTASC Standards #10)
16. seek leadership roles to promote the profession (InTASC Standard #10)
17. persist in helping each learner reach his/her full potential (InTASC Standard #2)
18. respect the input and contributions of families, colleagues, and other professionals.(InTASC Standards #1 and #7)

19. respect learners as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and varying skills, abilities, and interests (InTASC Standard #2)

**4 Point Scale**

- Very Well
- Moderately Well
- Minimally Well
- Not Well

**IV. *English Ed Program Changes (Deb Bieler)***

- The English department is making changes that necessitate changes in the English Education program. English majors no longer will be required to take ENGL 101. English faculty requested that English Education majors similarly not be required to complete ENGL 101. The total number of credits required for the degree will remain the same; candidates will have a free elective. UCTE unanimously approved the English faculty's request to remove ENGL 101 as an English Education program requirement.
- The English faculty also requested permission to make the following change in the Honors English Education program: To replace ENGL 480 "Literacy Studies Seminar" with ENGL 491 "Methods in Teaching Secondary English." UCTE unanimously approved this request.

**V. *Spanish Education Program Changes (Ali Alalou)***

- The Foreign Languages and Literatures faculty requested permission to make a change to the Spanish Education program. The candidate data indicate that Spanish Education teacher education candidates are struggling to achieve a rating of at least Advanced Low on the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). (This is not the case with French or Italian teacher education candidates.) The request is to add an additional conversation Spanish course, SPAN 205, as a required course in the Spanish Education major. To make room for this course in the major, the department requested permission to reduce the number of Spanish literature courses from three to two. UCTE unanimously approved the changes to the Spanish Education program.

**VI. *edTPA Vouchers (Barbara VanDornick)***

- UD has moved to full implementation of edTPA. At a meeting, Barbara VanDornick and Carol Vukelich learned that it was possible to achieve this status, even though not all programs will implement edTPA this spring. Moving to this status resulted in UD receiving 32 vouchers (10% of the number of recent graduates) of \$100 each to reduce the cost for candidates' edTPA portfolio submission. (The cost is \$300/portfolio.) Council discussed how these vouchers should be distributed. After discussion, council members voted unanimously to award the vouchers to candidates with the greatest financial need, as identified by the Financial Aids Office. Once a candidate is identified, Assessment Coordinator will ask the candidate's program coordinator to verify that the candidate is in good standing. In addition, council members agreed that a maximum of 2 vouchers would be awarded this spring, a maximum of 10

vouchers would be awarded in the fall, and the remaining vouchers would be awarded in spring 2016.

**VII. *Applitrack – Teacher Fit Assessment (Carol Vukelich)***

- This assessment is being used in priority schools in the Christina School District as a screening tool for employment. According to the research, teachers who receive a score of 6 or better are better able to impact high needs, low income students' learning. According to Cindy Holland from Career Services, Applitrack is one of several assessment tools attempting to assess the same skills in teacher applicants. Through an email exchange, Cindy agreed to provide special voluntary sessions for teacher candidates to learn more about these tools. Before proceeding with asking her to arrange such sessions, members decided that they would like to have Cindy Holland meet with them to discuss Applitrack and the other similar tools with team.

Meeting adjourned at 12:04.